



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum. Von OTTO
HOFFMANN. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht, 1906.
Pp. v + 284. M. 8.

Were the Macedonians Hellenic? This question which was first raised when Alexander I of Macedon presented himself as a competitor in the Olympic games (*Herod.* v. 22) has remained a fruitful subject of discussion down to the present day. Our historians generally answer in the affirmative, but among students of language there has been less unanimity of opinion. While the Hellenism of the Macedonians was long since asserted by Fick and in recent years has been warmly advocated by Hatzidakis, many have maintained a more skeptical attitude, like that of Kretschmer, who holds that the Macedonians were closely related to the Greeks, but still not strictly Greek. The question is, as admitted on all sides, really the linguistic one, Was the speech of the Macedonians a dialect of Greek? And the difficulty of answering this decisively lies in the meagerness of the material. It is a painful fact, but significant of the narrow horizon of linguistic interest among the Greeks, that of the speech which was still commonly used by the soldiers of Alexander the Great, nothing has been handed down to us, apart from the proper names, except some scattered glosses. However, this lack of interest in the Macedonian language furnishes no argument against its Hellenic character, for we should be no better off as regards many of the Greek dialects, if we depended upon any information furnished by Greek writers. It is from the inscriptions alone that we know many of these, and inscriptions in Macedonian are unfortunately lacking.

In the work before us the author has made the most of all the available material, including some few forms which have survived in the present Greek dialect of Macedonia, and subjected it to a critical and impartial examination. The chapter on the Macedonian vocabulary contains the first exhaustive study of the glosses which has been attempted since the early articles of Fick (1864 and 1874), and while many of the latter's explanations have been retained as obviously correct, the author has contributed no small number of new combinations. His conclusion is (pp. 111 ff.) that the great majority of the words are Greek, and of a dialect form which is inconsistent with the assumption of borrowing either from the Attic *κοινή* or the Ionic of the coast cities. They show

certain peculiarities common to Thessalian, and if borrowed at all must have been borrowed from Thessalian at an early period. But the proper names are also Greek from the earliest times, hence (p. 231) there is no ground for believing that the vocabulary was borrowed. Macedonian was then a Greek dialect, and a survey of its characteristics (pp. 232 ff.) shows that it is to be regarded as a sister dialect of Thessalian (p. 253).

Although I am far from convinced of the correctness of the author's new interpretation (pp. 232 ff.) of the use of the medial in place of the Greek aspirates (e. g., ἀβρούρες = δφρύες), which is the most marked peculiarity of Macedonian, and the one which has played the principal rôle in all recent discussions, yet it must be admitted that this divergence from all the recognized Greek dialects is not in itself sufficient to debar Macedonian from a place among them if the other evidence points in that direction. And on the whole I believe that Hoffmann's general conclusion is the one which best accords with the combined evidence, and in all probability is actually the correct one. But to admit that Macedonian is genetically a Greek dialect and related to Thessalian is not to deny that, owing to its detached history and the Thracian and Illyrian influence to which it was subjected, it is in a class by itself, and it might still be claimed that subjectively considered it was not a Greek dialect, that is, was not felt as such by the Greeks themselves. Apparently it was never appealed to as an argument for or against the Hellenism of the Macedonians, either by such an advocate of their Hellenism as Herodotus (v. 22), who elsewhere refers to the community of language among the Greeks (viii. 144), or by its opponent Demosthenes (*Philipp.* iii. 31 Φιλίππου . . . οὐ μόνον οὐχ' Ἕλληνας ὄντας οὐδὲ προσήκοντας οὐδὲν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ βαρβάρους . . .). Only in later times do we find any reference to community of language, as that in the speech of the Macedonian envoys at the council of the Aetolians in 200 B. C. (*Livy* xxxi. 29: Aetolos, Acarnanos, Macedonas, eiusdem linguae nomines), which may be based simply on their use of the Attic κοινή. That Macedonian was not understood, or at least not readily understood, by the Greeks, is apparent from the account of the trial of Philotas, who excused himself for not speaking in Macedonian on the ground that there were others besides Macedonians present, who he thought would understand him more easily if he used the same language which Alexander himself had just used (i. e. Greek) for no other reason than to be generally understood (*Q. Curtius* vi. 9. 35). But the same must have been true of several of the Greek dialects. A speech as delivered in Thessalian, Elean, etc., in their earlier form, before they were tempered by κοινή influence, would not have been readily followed, we may be sure.